

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claim 35 has been amended herein.

Amendments have been made to the specification to correct spelling errors.

**Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention (Office action paragraphs 2-3).**

The Examiner states that claim 11 recites that the material composing the device can be a I-VII compound, but that this is not supported by the specification.

The rejection of claim 11 is respectfully traversed. The recitation of "a I-VII group compound semiconductor" in claim 11 is supported by the disclosure of the specification on page 67, lines 1-3.

**Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite (Office action paragraphs 5-9).**

In paragraph 6 of the Office action, the Examiner states that claims 1 and 20 "show a potential gradient due to the piezoelectric effect but do not show under what bias conditions this gradient occurs." This remark appears to refer to the recitation "and having a strain generating a piezoelectric effect" in claim 1 on page 94, line 8 and in claim 20 on page 99, line 21, and the recitation in claim 20 of "a potential in said light emitting layer whose gradient is generated by said